1: Fitzgerald H-5 (1937-1938) AE3 Sino-Tibetan
Border Peoples AE3



It will be observed that Min Chia is much richer than Chinese in prepositions, and that these words are invariably of the "Old Min Chia" type. In Min Chia indeed there are prepositions for all shades of meanings ; on, onto, up, upon; and back, behind, after ; are distinguished as in English, whereas Chinese uses one word for these ideas. On the other hand Min Chia appears to have lacked most of the abstract nouns, and even words for such a common and vital activity as farming, perhaps a proof that in the earliest times the Min Chia were not an agricultural people. The names of most of the domestic animals, except the pig, are also "Old Chinese" and this may suggest that the Min Chia at one time had no other livestock.

Grammatically there are also certain marked differences between Chinese and Min Chia. In Min Chia the adjective may precede or follow the noun, the choice depending on euphony, whereas in Chinese it always comes first. Thus a fat pig and a fat goose in Min Chia are respectively *go dai a der* and *O a der go* and no rule can be framed to cover this usage. The preposition follows the noun, as in Chinese, although this is not necessary to distinguish meaning as in Chinese, because the Min Chia prepositions are differentiated. (*Shan shang*—on the mountain, in Chinese, *Shang shan*, the upper mountain, or to go up the mountain). Unlike the Chinese, the Min Chia put the negative after the noun or verb. *Bai mu*—not going, *hu mu*—not good, whereas in Chinese the reverse would be the case. In Min Chia the pronouns are still declined, there being a nominative, accusative, genitive, and dative case, not found in any other nouns, and non-existent now in Chinese. The Min Chia, of course, even those with Chinese education, are unaware of this fact, since they have no knowledge of grammatical terms, but a study of the usage of the pronoun words makes it clear that declensions exist.

1: Fitzgerald H-5 (1937-1938) AE3 Sino-Tibetan
Border Peoples AE3



193 197 Both languages use the device which has been called "numerical adjuncts" or "classifiers" unknown to European tongues, but familiar from the pidgin English expression "one piecee" preceding the noun. In Chinese the most part of the nouns use the classifier *i ke* which pidgin English has translated as "one piecee" but certain others exist also. In Min Chia the variety is extreme. More than sixty separate classifiers are in use (there may be many more) and of these only twelve are used for more than one or two nouns, and the greater number are only applied to a single noun. There are about six in which the application can be strictly covered by a rule, for example all animals have the classifier *a der* which follows the noun, not as in Chinese preceding it. *Mer a der* = a horse, *mer sa der* = three horses. *A ni*, the classifier for human beings is applied not only to the word for man, woman, etc, but also to nouns describing vocations, which is not the colloquial Chinese practice, e.g. *biu a ni* = a soldier. Two exceptions to this rule for animals and humans exist. Bandits are given the classifier *a der* thus ranking them with the animals and insects, and spirits and gods have the human *a ni* classifier. Malignant ghosts *ger* are on the other hand given *a der*, like animals, perhaps a distinction having the same origin as the *hun* and *po*, the spiritual and animal souls of men which the ancient Chinese distinguished.

563 That the Min Chia are therefore a distinct people is established, and as will be shown in subsequent chapters, their social and kinship systems show radical differences from the Chinese, while their religion retains many features unknown to China proper. Nor is there much evidence to connect them at all closely with the neighbouring non-Chinese peoples of Yunnan. The Na Khi or Mo So who border on the Min Chia to the north speak a very different language and their religion and social customs are equally distinct. All

193

## NOUNS

All nouns are preceded or followed by a classifier, of which there are more than fifty, but of which only twelve follow a general rule. With one exception the classifiers follow the noun, and also follow any numeral adjective qualifying the noun.

Examples : Mer, a horse, classifier, a der.

Mer der = a horse.
Mer a der = one horse.
Mer go der = two horses.

There are two forms of the plural.

(1) The limited plural " wa " used of a restricted number of things,
E.G. Your horses = Mer wa der lo lao.

(2) The indefinite plural Ya used of general categories.
E.G. Horses = Mer ya.

When ya is used the classifier is omitted.

There are no gender or case forms for nouns.

## CLASSIFIERS

The following twelve classifiers obey a general rule.

(1) A, precedes noun, for all units of measurement, both time and space. E.G. A chuoe = an inch. A bai ger = a night.

(2) A ao, follows noun. For all fruits. A peach = Da a ao. There are a number of other nouns taking a ao.

(3) A der, follows noun, applies to all non-human living creatures and also ghosts and bandits. E.G. A cat = A Mi a der.

(4) A dor, follows noun. Applies to flowers. E.G. Mai guei a dor, a rose.

(5) A dsur, follows noun. Applies to great lengths, such as rivers, roads. E.G. Gur a dsur = a river.

(6) A ga and a gua, follow noun, apply to short lengths, sticks, etc. E.G. Po a ga = a mast. Wa a gua = a beam.

(7) A ger, follows noun. Applies to enclosed spaces, buildings, cupboards. Ta wu a ger = a room. Tsur a ger = a gun.

(8) A jia, follows noun, applies to instruments, machines, etc. Dso ji ji a jia = a plough. Dser a jia = a clock.

(9) A iai, follows noun, applies to miscellaneous objects.

(10) A Ni, follows noun, applies to human beings and gods, except thieves. So yi ni = a merchant. Nuer ni = a woman.

## THE TOWER OF FIVE GLORIES

193 (11) A niu, follows noun, applies to long flexible objects, ropes, etc. E.G. Dso a niu = gut. Tai so a niu = a chain.

(12) A pu, follows noun, for limbs of the body. Ser a pu = an arm. Go a pu = a leg.

(13) A dso, follows noun, applied to trees. In other cases is irregular.

The following classifiers follow no rule and are only found with the nouns mentioned with them below.

A ba — Jiao i = a chair. Sai = a fan. Sa = umbrella. Ga gu = water-chestnut. Dsa = bill. So so = funeral.

A bai — Chieh = coin. Gai = bowl. Yeh guor = pipe. Ba = tub. Luai dser = wheel.

A ber — Chi da = scissors.

A bi — Hor pao = fire cracker.

A biu — Tsao ya dser = sunflower.

A chua — Ser = book. Shao suer = story.

A dai — Ber tso = cabbage.

A dao — So gu = ring.

A di — Gua der = bone.

A do — Shao mao = hat. Lu gu = maize plant.

A dsa — Ger = horn. Do = lamp.

A dser — Dser = city. I da = knife. Ma ba dao = swordstick. Dso dser = branch.

A dso — Piao = banknote. Dso = bed. Gur = bow. Ber = card. Hor = flower. Do ma = hair. Dsai zo zur dser = Carpet. So tiao = receipt. Wa = net. Tser = onion. Dser = paper. Dser dser = table. So ur = willow.

A duai — Mo = dream.

A du — Tsao hu = window. Ver = cloud.

A gao — Gao = lake. Gao = song. Ver = cloud.

A fa — Hao = house.

A jer — Gu = drum. Sai = temple.

A ji — Ngai = shoe. Chu ger = straw sandal.

A jieh — Hai ji = field.

A juee — Wu = beard. Wei = Buddhist image. Ser = god.

A jueh — Bi = bank, edge.

A kao — Da bi = carrying pole. Mo = grave. Da duai = mill.

A ka — Jiu = sedan chair.

A ker — A = saddle.

A ko — Ma gua = robe. Jier = well.

A kuai — Dsa sai = cocoon. Sai = egg. Sur = hill, mountain. So guai dser = elbow. Ji fer = place. Shua = garden.

## MIN CHIA GRAMMAR

193

A mi — Sua bai = abacus. Lao = gong. Ger = mirror. Jia shi hu = courtyard.
A mu — Ji = arrow.
A pi — Tiao gur = spoon. Wer = tile. Mo = wheatcake.
A ser — Dser = chopsticks.
A sai — Dsur = hoe. Bi = raincloak. Mai = gate, door.
A so — Gu = bridge.
A su — Yeh = ship, boat.
A ter — Chieh dser = pincers.
A tiao — Ger = meat.
A ta — Dao so dser do mo = thumb. So dser = finger.
A tieh — Ber = ancestral tablet.
A tso — Ju wai = face.
A yao — Mi bo = fence. Sai = leaf. Shier = mat. Tso ber = dressed stone. Ser ler = wood, a piece.
A yo — Ser ver = affair. Ber = disease. Gua yo = trousers.
A yu — Yu = village.
A wai — Der = cave.

## VERBS

General rule of word order is Subject-Verb-Object.
Tenses are indicated by the addition of suffixes or time adverbs.
Present tense. He goes = Bao bai
Past tense. He has gone = Bao bai hu lao
Other shades of past meaning are indicated by the use of adverbs such as do mo = formerly and 'i jiu' = already
He had gone = Bao i jiu bai hu lao
Future tense. He will go = Bao niu bai (niu = want, wish)
Conditional. Is indicated by prefixing the present or future tense structure by ' huer ' = if or ' ku pa ' = perhaps.
If he goes = huer bao bai
He would go = Ku pa bao bai
This can also mean ' perhaps he would go ' the sense being determined by context.
Passive. Is indicated by two particles, dsor and do which follow the subject and terminate the phrase respectively.
He was struck by a stone = Bao dsor tso kuai ger der do
' Do ' can be ommitted and lao substituted.
They were burnt to death = Ba dsor shu shia lao

## THE TOWER OF FIVE GLORIES

193 Negative. Is formed with the use of Biao = no. Bo and Mu = not and Dor = cannot.

It is not mine = Ngao lao *biao*
I do not know = Ngao zo *bo* do
(Here bo = not, is inserted between zo do = to know.)
I had not seen him before = Ngao do mo a do bao *mu*
(Mu always terminates the phrase.)
He cannot arrive = Bao pia dor
I cannot get up = Ngao bai ku dor
Can be said but not done = Shua chi der dser chi dor (Proverb)
Der = can, the positive antitheses of dor is used in the same way.
He can manage = Bao ba der

Interrogative. The ordinary form is ni mu.

Can you come ? = Lao bai dso ni mu ?
Have (you) any as big as this = Dso lo lai dao lao ni mu ?
Will (you) sell ? = Gur ni mu ?
Niu der ni niu dor ? Used in the same way as ni mu.
Have you leased a house ? = Lao kao hao niu der ni niu dor ?
Will this do ? = Lo lai niu der ni niu dor ?
Questions can be expressed by stating both alternatives with bo = not or ni = or in between.
Is it enough ? = Lu *bo* lu ?
Will you dye it red or black ? = Niu zai huor lao *ni* her lao ?
When interrogative adverbs and adjectives are employed no other form is used.
When did he come ? = Bao *ha ta* bai dso hu la ?
What are you doing ? = Lao dser *ha lai* ?
How many are there ? = Dso *ji* lai ?
Who is that ? = Du ni dso ha ni ?
How much money have you = Lao dso ji shio chien

Exceptions. To rain = O ver shi (O = to fall of rain, etc.) or Ver shi o.

The wind blows = Bi ser po
Yu, to come; only used in conjunction with prepositions.
To come back = Da yu
To come down = To yu
To come through = Tur yu
To come downstairs = Gai to lo yu

MIN CHIA GRAMMAR

193 •

## ADJECTIVES

This = Lo, these = lo dier

That = Ber, du, those = Ber dier, du dier

*Rule.* Follow noun but precede classifier.

This thing = Hu nger lo lai

That mountain = Sur du (ber) kuai

These horses are faster than those = Mer lo dier bi dudiernger jiu

Numerals precede classifier:

These two horses = Mer lo go der

(When a numeral is used the plural form ' dier ' is omitted.)

Adjectives either precede or follow noun and classifier ; the only rule is euphony.

These two fast horses = Mer *lo* go der *nger jiu*

A high mountain = Sur a kuai *ga* or *Ga* sur a kuai

A small matter = *Sai* ser ver a yo

A far off place = Ji fer kuai *duai*

A fat goose = O a der *go*

A fat pig = *Go* dai a der

A hungry dog = Kwa a der ji ka

To day it is cold = Ger ni hai ji *gur*

## PRONOUNS

The personal pronouns are declined in four cases. No other pronouns or nouns have these modifications.

| | *Nominative and Accusative* | *Genitive* | *Dative* | *Ablative* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| I | = Ngao | Ngao lao | Ngo lao | Ngo mo |
| Thou | = Lao | Lo lao | Lo lao | Lo mo |
| He | = Bao | Bo lao | Bo lao | Bo mo |
| We | = Nia | Nia lao | Nia lao | Nia mo |
| You | = La | La lao | La lao | La mo |
| They | = Ba | Ba lao | Ba lao | Ba mo |

EXAMPLES:

Nominative and Accusative. I am going to find him = *Ngao* bai yi *bao*

Genitive. Your money = La lao chieh.

Exception. Ngao mao = my mother. Relatives do not take the genitive case.

193 Dative. Yesterday I said to him = Ngao dser sai ni da *bo lao* shua
He cursed me = Bao ur *ngo lao*

Ablative. He wants money from me = Bao lai *ngo mo* chieh
Ru = to call takes the ablative
Call him (to come) = ru *bo mo* bai dso
Ablative is also used with Jier = to borrow
I borrowed money from you (thee) = Ngao jier lo mo chieh

Relative pronouns. Who = Ha ni, A la ni
Whose = Ha ni lao
What = Ha lai, ha ya
Which = A la lai

E.G. Who are you = Lao dso *ha ni* ?
Whose is this ? = Lo lai dso *ha ni* lao ?
What house is this = Lo lai dso *ha ya (ha lai)* hao
Which do you want ? = Lao niu *a la lai* ?

## PREPOSITIONS

Back = Da (only used with verb to come ' yu ' to mean return)
Bai da yu = to come back

Behind = Ur dao bai
The sun is behind the mountain = Nieh pi dso sur *ur dao bai*
Behind the wall = O ur dao bai
They are coming behind = Ba ur dao bai bai dso

In front, before = Do Mo. After = Bo ru (used in time sense only.)
They are in front = Ba do mo bai
After the rain = Ver shi o *bo ru*
Some years later = Wa shua *bo ru*

Ru = next. Only used in time and age contexts
Next day = Ru ni
Next year = Ru shua
He is next (in age) = Bao dso ru

Ago = Do (' Up ' i.e. the stream of time)
Some years ago = Do wa shua
Last month = Do wa
The year before last = Do shua

Under = Er

193

## MIN CHIA GRAMMAR

Underneath = Er bao  Above (onto) = Do bao
Hsia Kuan = Er Guer  Shang Kuan = Do Guer
Underneath the stone = Tso kuai er bao
Under the trees = Dso ya er bao
Under water (exception) = Shuee hu
The bird is flying over the house = Dso der ler hao *de bao*
The clouds are above the hill = Ver ya dso sur *do bao*
Climb onto a rock = Gai dso tso kuai do bao

Down = to  Up = dso
Coming down the mountain = Sur lao *to* yu
Go down to Hsia Kuan = Bai *to* Er Guer
Down stream = Ger *to* (Lit : flow down)
Up stream = Ger *dso*
To climb up stairs = Gai *dso* lo ti

On = lao  Off = to (Same as down.)
On the mountain = Sur lao
On the table = Dser dser lao

To, until, till = Pia  From = Yo
He lived to be eighty = Bao her pia bia dser shua
Wait till I return = Do pia ngao bai da yu
It is thirty li to Hsia Kuan = Pia Er Guer dso sa dser lai
He comes from the lake = Bao yo gao bai dso

At = dso  In = hu, ku  With = da  Out = wa
He is at Ta Li = Bao dso Dai Lai
He is at home = Bao dso hao der
In the water = Shuee hu
In the cupboard = Gur ger hu
In the town = Dser ku
In Yunnan = Yueh La ku
In the fields = Hai ya ku

*Rule.* Hu, is used for confined spaces and water;
Ku, is used for indefinite unenclosed spaces.
Out of town = Dser wa
Other provinces = Wa so
Inside and outside = Ker bao and wa bao
In the house = Hao ker bao
It is cold out = Wa bao gur
Put it inside = Lai ker bao

23:Benedict E-3 (no date) 1941 A1.1 Southeast Asia AL1
Sino-Tibetan Border Peoples AE3



SA 121 601 ST 121 601 a phonemic system, in which similar integration appears. The point is not worth elaborating, since the fact that a kinship terminology does constitute a system hardly relieves us of the task of investigating each element of that system, both independently and correlatively.

In any piece of historical reconstruction, linguistic or other, the natural tendency is to make the prototype unduly complex. The writer has often been struck by the complexities shown by hypothetical reconstructed languages as compared with their actual living descendants, as though linguistic evolution always proceeded in the direction of simplification. The number of distinct roots assigned to these reconstructed languages is sometimes of staggering magnitude, and no ingenuity is spared in augmenting this lexicographical harvest. In the present study it would be easy to reconstruct an archaic nomenclature with two or more terms for most relationships, yet such a procedure patently would be futile. It is far better to determine, firstly, which elements are relatively certain, and, secondly, which elements are based largely on "partial equations" and must thus be held in reserve until a basic framework has been set up. Nine roots, eight of which are SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197 applied to consanguineal relatives, stand out in our complete Tibeto-Burman series as culled from the foregoing review. These roots constitute the following systems

SA
601
193
197
ST
601
193
197

## Tibeto-Burman Terms

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| *p'i gH | | *p'u gF |
| *ma M | | *p'a F |
| *ni YH1 | | *k'u HB |
| | *mam yGb | |
| | *as Ch | |
| | | *mak 51 |

The forms given above can be accepted with some confidence as fair approximations of the archaic Tibeto-Burmen roots. All except the affixal term *mak have vocalic finals, and it was on the basis of finals or "rhymes" (medial vowel + final consonant), especially of vocalic finals, that Shafer and the writer were able to work out the main features of Tibeto-Burmen phonology. Earlier writers had in general attacked the problem from the most difficult angle, that of initials and tones. Thus, no less a scholar than Laufer is responsible for the following absurd dictum:

> Prefixes as well as final consonants....are of minor importance in the comparative study of Indo-Chinese languages.... the staff of comparison remains the initial consonant and the tone conditioned by it. (TP 17, p. 115).

Prefixes have shown to be of basic importance, while both the initials and the tones have been so influenced by the prefixes that our analysis of them still lags far behind our analysis of the finals. In the above set of terms, however, the only problems in re initials concern the aspiration or lack of aspiration, voicing or unvoicing, of the stop initials of *p'i, *p'u, *p'a, and *k'u. Rukish has *pi gH and *pu gF,

SA 6001 193 197 ST 6001 193 197

but initial aspiration is not well preserved in this group. Nikir has p'i gH, p'u gF, ku < *k'u HB, but po < *pa F. Meithei, which ordinarily preserves aspiration, has pu gF, po F, and ku Fl (< HB). Kachin has ku HF (< HB) rather than the anticipated *k'u, and Burmese has (ata-)kui oB rather than *k'ui. Tibetan has p'yi gL, p'a F, and k'u FB (< HB), while both Tibetan and Kachin have p'u oB (< gF). It may be that one or more of these roots had a sonant rather than a surd initial. Initial g-, a rare element in our comparative material, is perhaps indicated for the HB root (*gu ~ *g'u), but at present nothing definite can be said on this point.

Only one of the above terms is uncertain as regards final, viz. *ni FSl. Classical Tibetan has ne rather than *ni, and Meithei has nem~ne rather than *ni, both of which point to an archaic form *nei rather than *ni. The weight of evidence, however, speaks in favor of the reconstruction *ni, from which *nei may have been developed as a doublet root; cf. Kukish *nam yOb, *nou "young, tender", which tend to be confused (vide pt. 15).

The basic gF terms *p'i and *p'u are found together in Burish, Nikir, Meithei, Mru, Kukish, and Burmish-Lolcish (but $p'e^{3}$ ggF < *p'i in Burmese itself, which has a new term [$p'wa^{3}$] for gF). The root *p'i is further retained in its basic meaning in Tibetan, Khasuri (perhaps Tibetan loan-word), Baking, and Vayu, while Gheng has retained it in the meaning "gF". In northern TB groups the root *p'u has been applied

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

to oB, viz. in Tibetan, Limbu, Newari (only in combination), Digaro, and Kachin. This semantic interchange also appears in Burmish-Loloish, viz. Moso p'u gF, bu oB, Nyi bu gF, bu oB. The interplay of surd and sonant initials in these Moso and Nyi forms indicates that doublets are involved. In Barish the root *p'i gM (in the form bi) has been applied to oSi, both in the Bodo-Dimasa and Garo divisions of this group, and also retained in its basic meaning. It is clear that these usages are connected with the especial position held by oSb, and that the gP terms function here simply as honorifics. Other TB roots, less widely distributed than the above, show the same type of semantic shift (vide infra). In societies with a patrilineal bias it is only natural that the role of oB should be of more significance than that of oSi, thus perhaps accounting for the relative stability of *p'i as compared with *p'u. It can hardly be without significance that in the single matrilineal group encountered (Barish) the term *p'i gM should have been applied to oSi, in contrast to all other TB groups.

Of the two basic P terms *p'a F and *[illegible] M, the former is the most widely distributed and shows fewer variations. The following groups have this root (*p'a): Tibetan, Kanauri, Byangsi, Bahing, Vayu, Newari, Lepcha, Miri, Dhimal, Burmish-Loloish, Konyak, Barish, Mikir, Meithei, Mru, and Kukish. This root commonly appears as a masculine affix, but no instance of a transference to "oB" has been uncovered. The

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

root *ma M appears in Tibetan, Kanauri, Bahing, Vayu, Newari, Lepcha, Dhimal, Burmish-Loloish, Barish, and Meithei. In Burmese itself it is retained only in the terms ma' Si and a-ma' "feminine suffix", and in the closely-related Maru only in the meaning "MSi". Yru has preserved this root only in the feminine suffix -ma. A transference to the meaning "oSi" is found in the contiguous North Assam groups Dafla and Aka. In Kachin and the extensive Kukish group this root appears to have vanished without leaving a trace.

The two PSb terms *ni and *k'u are also unequally represented in Tibeto-Burman. The root *ni FSi is of almost universal occurrence. In its basic meaning it appears in Tibetan, Gyarung, Kanauri, Thebor, Vayu, Newari, Abor-Miri, Nung, Burmish-Loloish (but not in Burmese itself), Konyak, Barish, Mikir, Meithei, and Kukish. Kachin has retained it only in the affinal meaning "WM". Aka, if we can trust our inadequate sources, has applied this root to M, while Limbu has applied it to oSi. Replacement by the term for "oSi" is seen in Dafla, Sho, Changki (Ao), and probably Kadu, while Mongsen (Ao) shows replacement by the term for "oSb". The Dafla material indicates that this is an analytical development ("oSi of F"). Lepcha equates FSi with *Bi in the term nyu ~ nyo, applied to female relatives in the uterine line. This unusual equation also appears in Bahing, which has mo-mo MSi,FSi (from mo < *ma M), and po-po FB (from po < *pa F), yet has ku-ku MB. Distinct terms have been

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

developed in Kachin (mai), which preserves *-i as an affixal form (WH), and in Burmese (ri$^{3}$), but *-i is retained in the closely related Maru. The Dimasa form de-de FBi (be-de MB) is likewise distinct.

The much more restricted root *k'u MB is found in its primary meaning in Bahing, Vayu, Abor-Miri, Dafla, Digaro, Mung, Mikir, and Ao. Tibetan has k'u FB, but akud < *k'u Fl,Bl. Himalayish and Lepcha also have k'u FB, probably because of Tibetan influence. Kachin, Meithei, Ntenyi Rengma, and Anyo Rengma have retained the term in the affixal meaning "HF" (Meithei Fl), and Sema in the affixal meaning "FBiH". Chang (Konyak) has the form ko MB, which cannot with certainty be connected with this root. In the Burmish-Lolish group we can cite only Burmese hui "prefix used with names of persons older or of higher rank than the speaker, or politely of his equals" (ate-hui eB), Akha a-hõ B, Ahi hõ-pa-li yBiH, and Moso a-gu Bl. The Moso usage is paralleled in the Barish group, where we find Bodo gu-mai, Garo gu-ma Bl. This root cannot be traced in the Naki languages proper, yet can be reconstructed for Nukish on the basis of the Naga terms (supra), and for Nukie in general on the basis of the Mikir and Meithei terms.

The root *nau yBb, occasionally applied either to yB or yBi alone, also to Ch, is well represented in Tibeto-Burman. It appears in the following groups: Tibetan (nu ~ no), Byangsi (yB), Limbu, Lepcha, Aka, Kachin, Konyak, Barish (yBi), Meithei, Mru (yB), and Nukish (yBb ~ Ch). The most conspicuous gaps are those in Abor-Miri-Dafla, Mung, and Burmish-Lolish.

SA
601
193
197
ST
601
193
197

The eighth and last of the basic consanguineal terms is *ŋa Gh, which is found in Tsangla, Nagari, Miju, Abu, Kachin, Maru, Nung (na-mi D), Pyu, Burmish-Lolcish, Konyak, Barish, Hkahr, Meithei, Mru, and Mukish (rarely used for ySb, as in Pouren and Kyau). Lepcha has a-no < *na gŋ², a-non gCh (with suffixed -n). This root is conspicuously absent in Tibetan and its dialects (but present in Tsangla, a Bodish language), Himalayish, and Kiranti, i.e. the northern or northwestern band of Tibeto-Burman languages, as well as in the Abor-Miri-Dafla group.

The affinal term *mak Sl appears in Tibetan, Lepcha ( < *gmak), Dhimal ( < *gmak), Miri, Kachin (da-ma < *da-mak), Burmese (ma-mak), Meithei, Mru, and Mukish, with an additional uncertain occurrence in Byangai. In view of our generally inadequate data on affinal nomenclatures (e.g. we do not have the term for "Sl" in Nung, where we should expect to find this root), the widespread distribution of this root is of increased significance. It would appear that the root is lacking in Himalayish, Hkahr, Konyak, and Barish.

The above set of basic terms is supplemented by a series of roots of restricted distribution. Some of these serve mainly as replacements for the basic roots, while others are functionally more independent. Since our set of basic terms is not complete, we must assume that some of these roots represent archaic Tibeto-Burman elements, but this point is best discussed after the various secondary roots have been analyzed.

23:Benedict E-5 (no date) 1941 ALl Southeast Asia ALl
Sino-Tibetan Border Peoples AE3



SA
601
193
197
ST
601
193
197

The gF roots *p'i gM and *p'u gF have no serious rivals in Tibeto-Burman. A curious link between Tibetan and Southern Naki is suggested by the following set of terms: Tib. po ~ spo gF (literary or dialectical), rmo gM (literary), and Sho a-pŏ ~ a-pŏk gF, Chinbon kh-mo gM, Yindu kh-mo gF. A possible root *ai is indicated by Balti as-si (= a-si) ggM, Kung a-si gM, Khami a-um-si gF, and Kadu a-si MSi (i-si "woman"), Yindu kh-si FSi, Sho a-si FSi, oSi (cf. the roots *ta and *tei, infra). In general, gF terms show more variation than do F terms; thus, Kachin has developed distinct terms for both gM (woi) and gF (ji), and note forms such as Byangsi ti-ti gF, Bahing and Vayu ki-ki gF.

The most conspicuous of the secondary F roots is *nu M, which appears in Kachin, Miju, Sak, Konyak, Naikish, and perhaps Mikir and Meithei (in combination). The root *pui "mother, female" is restricted to Mikir and Naikish. The Naikish feminine affix *la, used especially of young females, seems to have given rise to Mongsen-Changki (Ao) a-la M, Ntenyi Rengma a-la ggM, Anyo Rengma a-la gM, and cf. Byangsi la-la gM, Sunwari a-la Si. The same root (*la) appears in Kachin, Burmish-Loloish, and elsewhere as a masculine affix. The Tibeto-Burman root *wa "male" serves to explain both Bunan and Kachin wa, Kadu a-wa, Garo (dialects of A type) a-wa F (Moshang and Mansang wa F probably through Kachin influence), Aka au < *a-wa F, Burmese wa-kri[3] "term of address to old man" (Arakanese dialect), and Lepcha a-vo < *wa, Meithei (ma-)wa, Naikish wa H; cf. also Digaro ma-wa "male",

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

Mikir -ne 'masculine suffix', Bodo hoan "male". Some of these forms, however, may have resulted from a phonetic development from *p's F (probably via *ha).

A root *mei or *me appears sporadically in Tibeto-Burman, sometimes with a dental suffix. This root is parallel to, but distinct from, TB *ma M. The following forms belong here: Tibetan -med "woman" (in bud-med < *bu-med, paralleling bu-rmed), Gyarung to-mi ~ to-me "virgin", Kanauri -med (suffix in "D" and "Nl"), Chamba Lahuli me "bitch", Limbu met W, Lepcha a-mit "woman", Kuki a-me M, Mung a-me M (cf. Mung a-p'e F), Burmese a-mi$^{3}$ ~ a-me M, and Garo me-ek "woman, wife". Note also the series formed by Burmese a-mi$^{3}$, Ahom a-mi, Mung a-mi D (from *a Ch). Garo ga-me Bl, Mikir me SiH correspond phonetically but can scarcely be fitted in otherwise.

In addition to the above, there are traces of a set of roots *ya and *yu, both applied to female relatives. The former is better attested than the latter; cf. Himalayish (Manchati, Kanashi, Chamba Lahuli) ya M, Aber-Miri and Dafla ya < *ya gM (but in Pagri Miri used for "M" in address), Tshangla (Monyak group) ya M, Naga *ya M, also Kanauri yas, Kuki (Kiranti) ma-ya, Burmese ma-ya$^{3}$ W, Digaro mi-ya "woman", ka-mi-ya W. The root *yu is represented only by Kanauri yu-med, Khambu (Kiranti) yuh, Lepcha a-yu W, Lepcha tA-yu "woman", and perhaps Tibetan yu-mo "female of a stag".

Nothing has yet been said of o5b terms, which show a wide variety of forms contrasting with the standard y5b root (*yaa

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

Much of the material in this connection is of a scattered nature from which it is difficult to draw any conclusions. Thus, Byangsi hya, Bahing ya cB, Meithei ya-ra cB, Chawte (Old Kuki) a-ya B, si-ya sCl, and Khasi ya-at ~ ya-i cB suggest an archaic root *ya cB, yet this same element appears in another setting (supra). Burmese ste-hni < *tik-hni sB, Mikir ik cB look cognates elsewhere, as do Maru pai cCl, Chonbok pai cCl(ws), unless the latter pair be connected with Burmese a-pai "under" and perhaps Mikir pei ~ pe M. The characteristic Kukish root u cSb (Central, Northern, and Old Kuki groups only) does not appear elsewhere in this setting, yet appears to be identical to Shs ŭ M, Taungthu u M, Maru u M, and Burmese $u^3$ MB (prefixed to names of men considerably older than the speaker), perhaps also Tshgkhul a-ŭ gF,MB.

Three or four roots, however, stand out more prominently than the above lot and deserve especial consideration. Tibetan c'e cCl(ws) has been compared with Himalayish *c'e "female" as represented by Kanauri c'ets "female, woman", Kanashi c'ets W (with diminutive suffix -ts) and with the Byangsi-Chaudangsi term c'e xC, as well as with Johar a-ce F? The above terms all point to a TB root *c'ei. A similar root, but apparently with unaspirated initial (*cei), is represented by Konyak jei ~ cei cSb ~ cB, Meithei ce cCl, Tangkhul cei cSb, Western Kuki *cei cSb, Anyo Rangma a-ce cSb. The Tibetan term appears to be etymologically connected with the word c'e-ba "great", from which the respectful term gcen-po cB has been developed.

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

A Thai *-an cH1 appears in Khmu, Vayu, Kachin, Andro, and Konyak, while the Digaro and Abor-Miri-Dafla groups have *-an H, and Lakher has the vocative term 1-an H. Tibetan mna D1 perhaps also belongs here, though it may be of periphrastic origin (< mna "seth").

The Tibeto-Burman root *-ta (often in the form da) is consistently applied to relatives older than Ego, if one regards the Bahing-Vayu root *-ta CH as of distinct origin. The following terms can be grouped with this root: Tibetan 'a-da F (dialectical), cH (Eastern Tibet), Tsangla a-ta cH, Gyarung a-ta-ta F, Johar a-ta cH1, Byangsi ta-ta cH1, Newari ta-ta cH1, Miri and Dafla a-to < *-ta gF, Digaro ta gF, da cH, Burmese t'e$^{3}$-t'e$^{3}$ F (dialectical), Akha a-ta F, Independent Lolo a-da F, Shy a-ta cH, Ghinbon (Ka-)t'a cH, Lhota a-ta cH, Changki (Ao) a-ta FH1,cH1, Naung Rangum a-da FcH. Doublet forms are found only in Digaro (ta gF, da cH). Unlike *p'u gF,cH this root has also been applied to F in some languages (Tibetan, Gyarung, Burmese, Akha). Desgodins describes the Tibetan term 'a-ta as a "children's word" (vox puerorum), and in Independent Lolo a distinction is made between a-da F (used by children) and a-bu ~ a-bo F (used by adults).

Kanauri ta-ta gF, a-ta cH are clearly of a type paralleling that described above. The suggested TB root is *-tai, with which can be grouped Byangsi ta-ta nC(ss), Dafla tă-tă FyH,cH (in different sources), Kadu a-ta cH1, Bangaru a-tai cH, Mikir ta cH1(vs), Kaithei i-tai-an cH1l, and Khu a-tai DW.

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

An objection might be raised to the above discussion on the ground that forms such as *na, *ta, and *tsi (te) are of "nursery word" ty[illegible] and should not be regarded as representing actual TB roots. The writer himself originally ascribed to this general point of view, but the collection of material on which this study is based has led him to discard it. Thus, ta F appears both in the West Tibetan dialects (Balti, Purik) and in the nomad dialects of Eastern Tibet, as well as in the aberrant Gyarung language, whence we can safely infer a Bodish root *ta F. The term na oSi appears in five distinct languages representing two different foci (Murmi-Vayu and Kachin-Andro-Konyak), and na H in two isolated groups (Almora and Abor-Miri-Dafla). Distributions of this type are scattered, to be sure, yet not entirely random. The cluster of connotations (gP,P,oSb) around these roots is also not without significance.

The majority of the terms for Sb(ds) are of limited distribution. Tibetan sring-mo Si(ms), dialectically used for ySi, appears also in Himalayish (Si) and Byangsi (ySi), with an additional possible occurrence in Chimal-Toto (Si). Kachin jan < *jar Si(ms), often used for ySi, is directly related to Kukish *dzar Si(ms), which in Western Kuki is used for ySi, and to Meithei i-cal ~ i-can ySi, Kadu san, Sengmai cil ySi. Kachin jung B(ws) has been compared with the Garo-Dimasa root *yung yB. The tendency to equate Sb(ds) with ySb is reflected in all three roots.

The roots *nau ySb and *za Ch are of almost universal occurrence and have no serious rivals. The former is

SA 6001 193 197 ST 6001 193 197

conspicuously absent in Burmish-Loloish, which has a root *nyi (ńi), comparable with Lepcha nyi-t'i gCh. A root *nga is suggested by Murmi and Gurung a-nga ySi, Miri ăng-ă ySb, Dafla ang-a Ch, Naga *nga Ch. Isolated roots *a Ch and *ka Ch are represented by Digaro a, Abor-Miri e < a Ch, and Newari ka, Abor-Miri ke < *ka Ch, respectively.

It will be noted that the set of basic terms presented above lacks all collateral terms as well as a gCh term. Our data on collateral terms are incomplete for many groups, so that negative evidence here is of relatively little value, but it would seem that no root or roots for xC have been developed. The only root of any extension here is *ning, which appears in Kachin (xCe,ws), Chang (xC), Mikir BW(ws), and perhaps Garo (Sbl). The Mikir and Garo affinal meanings can be explained in terms of cross-cousin marriage.

Three or perhaps four TB roots show a tendency to equate M with gCh. Tibetan ts'a Ne (probably SiS,ms),gCh furnishes an example of this tendency. Bahing and Newari have this root (*ts'a) in the meaning "gS", but in the Kiranti languages in general it is used for "S" (see the discussion in pt. 4). Kanauri c'ad Sl (with suffixed -d) has been brought into comparison via SiS(ms), equated with Sl under cross-cousin marriage. Kachin ta'a MB,MBS(ws) can be explained only on the basis of a reciprocal development from SiS(ms). Mikir c-sa SiS(ms),Sl shows an ideal agreement on the semantic side, but the comparison is phonetically dubious. The root *ts'a appears to be lacking in other groups.

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

The roots *su and *tu have distributions which are almost, if not quite, mutually exclusive. *Su gCh appears in Kachin, Bodo, Mikir, and Meithei, while *tu appears in Nung (N), Burmish-Loloish (xN), and Kukish (FSiCh,SiCh,ms,gCh). Anu, a Southern Kuki language, has su xC,ySi(ws),SiCh(ws),gCh, and a-su-lai SiCh(ms), covering much the same ground as Kukish *tu. The roots *su and *tu must be regarded as distinct on general phonetic grounds, and this view is strengthened by the evidence from Meithei, which has i-su gCh as well as (ma-)tu W (cf. the Kuki use of *tu in the meaning "SI", through cross-cousin marriage). The root *su is perhaps also represented in the Naga languages, in much the same setting as Anu su, viz. Angami cu ~ tsu FSiS,ySiS(ms),gS, Nzong Rengma a-cu-gü, Ntenyi Rengma a-su-wa, Anyo Rengma a-zü FSiCh,SiCh(ms),gCh, but our knowledge of Naga phonology is not sufficiently advanced to establish this comparison.

A fourth root of the same general type is *ma-li, which is found in Nung (gCh), Burmish-Loloish (gCh), Pyu (gCh), Chang (xN), Garo (SiS,ms), Mikir (xN, probably BCh,ws), and has an additional cognate in Kachin (ma-li "young man"). This root is in general lacking in Kukish, but may be represented by Taungtha lwi Ne,Ni and Yindu (ka-)li BD(ws). It cannot be traced in Tibetan or any of the northern languages.

The affinal root corresponding to *mak Si is perhaps *nam Di, but the evidence for the latter root is not altogether satisfactory. Lepcha has nyom < *snam Di paralleling nyok < *smak Si, and s- prefixed forms are also represented by

SA 601 193 197 ST 6001 193 197

Kansuri stem < *snom (probably for snăm) D1, and Barish *snam D1 (based on Dimasa ba-ham, Garo nam). Cf. also Gyarung snom < *snam Si, Burmese hnam < *snam ySi(ms) (inferred from mong-hnam "H and W", where mong means "yB,wa"), Lashi tu-nam D1, nam-mo ySi(ms), Nyi nŏ-mo < *nam-mo ySi(ms), and Lushei hnăm < *snăm "clan". The unprefixed form appears in Byangsi nam-sia D1, Kachin nam D1,ySil, and Nung nam Sb, while Lepcha has both nyom < *snam D1 and nom < *nam oSi. Magari ar-năm "girl" also belongs in this series.

Of more restricted distribution are the roots *mou D1, represented by Kukish mou (Lushei mo), Meithei i-mau, and perhaps Tibetan mo "woman", and *k'rwi Sl, represented by Kachin k'ri Sl,SiCh(ms), Burmese k'rwe$^{3}$-ma$^{3}$ < *k'rwi$^{3}$-ma$^{3}$, Lisu c'i-ma D1 (with feminine suffix -ma), and perhaps Lepcha tă-gri "male". The original meanings of these roots may have been simply "female" and "male", respectively.

There remain for consideration a few poorly represented roots connected primarily with the PSb nomenclature. Nung a-tsim MSi is comparable with Tsangla a-zim, id., and Nung a-wang FB with Garo a-wang FyB, also Lashi wang-mo HF,FoSiH, Maru vung ~ vun HF,FSiH (but the Lashi and Maru terms suggest a meaning "MB" rather than "FB"). The *wang series is perhaps connected with Tibetan 'a-bang FSiH,MSiH (literary), Limbu (am-)pang-a "uncle", Vayu pong-pong < *pang-pang FB.

Tibetan sru MSi has been compared with Kansuri and Chamba Lahuli ru Fl, Pyu sru "relatives", and the reconstructed

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

Lolo root *ru MB. If these terms actually constitute a true series, we must reconstrupt a root *sru ~ *ru "mother's relatives" (neuter), whence Kanauri ru Fl < MB through cross-cousin marriage, paralleling Kanauri o'ad Sl < SlS(ms). The presence of this root in Pyu, at approximately the year A.D. 1000, lends some weight to this view.

The fourth Tibetan PSb term, viz. ʾs-ˇsang MB, is found in this form in Thebor and Lepcha, where it must be regarded as a loan-word, but not elsewhere. This form can be derived from an original *srang and thus compared with Hru ta-rang FSiH,HF, Kukish ta-rang~ ma-rang, id., and probably Lhota o-nrã, Chenghi (Ao) (kĕ-)hrem Sl(ws). Burmese a-hrang < *srang (archaic spelling is a-hsyang) "lord, master" also perhaps belongs here rather than with sring-mo Si (supra). The writer has long suspected that Tibetan initial ˇz- and ˇs- have in many instances been derived from zr- and sr-, respectively, partly because of the general instability of these clusters in Tibetan (cf. srab-srib ~ hrab-hrib ~ rab-rib "dim, obscure"), and partly on the basis of comparative material, viz. Tib. ˇsig "louse", Bunan ˇsrig, Lushei hrik < *srik; Tib. ˇzag "day (24 hours)", Burmese rak, id.; Tib. ˇsags "joke, jest" (in sense of "ridicule"), Bunan ˇsrag "shame", Burmese hrak < *srak "to be ashamed". The root *-rang (prefixed) must have had a generalized honorific force (still retained in Burmese), and thus was admirably suited as a periphrastic term either for MB or for FSiH,HF (= MB under cross-cousin marriage).

SA
601
193
197
ST
601
193
197

Having completed our review of Tibeto-Burman kinship roots, we are now faced with the problem of fixing the basic pattern of nomenclature for this linguistic family. The terms designating relatives in the central line of descent naturally form the most stable segment of the nomenclature, while the collateral terms show an intermediate, and the affinal terms a maximum, amount of variation.

Within this stable core of nomenclature we are able to distinguish two primary gP terms (gM and gF), two primary P terms (M and F), a neuter yŏb term, and a neuter Ch term. The two neuter terms are often employed in a masculine sense (yŏ and ŏ), with sex affixes used in forming the corresponding feminine terms (yŏi and D), e.g. Tibetan bu ŏ, bu-mo D, Burmese $a^3$ ŏ, $a$-$mi^3$ D. No neuter P terms have been uncovered, but Chang has a neuter gP term (a-gi < ŋp'i gi) used only in address, and a neuter gF term is also found in Sema (a-pu-a), and in the Southern Naki languages Sho (a-pŏ) and Ayaing Khami (a-ua-ai). Three Southern Naki languages (Chinbok, Yindu, Anu) make a distinction between FM and MM, but have a single term for gF (Anu FM < M, MM < gM). Four gP terms appear only in rare instances, and are never all primary. Both Tibetan and Kanauri show traces of three or four gP terms, but Kanauri has probably borrowed one or more of its gP terms from Tibetan, and the Tibetan material itself can be interpreted in more than one way. Meithei seems to employ four gP terms, perhaps because of Shan influence, but has only two primary terms (ji gF and woi gM). Garo distinguishes

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

between "gF" (= FF) and "gM" (= FM), and "my gF" (= MF) and "my gM" (= MM), if we can trust our sources for this language. In view of the fact that the Garo are a matrilineal group, this point is of some interest. Chang, which uses the neuter term a-pi gF in address, employs four terms in reference, the FF and FM terms being formed through affixed sex elements, and the MF and MM terms through analysis. Finally, Laiyo, which has an almost exclusively analytical nomenclature, employs four analytical gF terms.

A number of different arrangements of Sb terms have been encountered. Age distinctions appear everywhere and are, in general, more prominent than sex distinctions. Despite this, however, it would appear that the basic pattern has two primary terms for oB and oSi, contrasting with the single neuter ySb term (*msu). As has been shown above, the widespread tendency to equate oB and oSi with terms for relatives of ascending generations has obscured the general picture here and has made analysis almost impossible. The simplest possible arrangement (oSb and ySb) has been found only in Khami (Ayaing and Awa) and Anyo Rongma. A single primary term for oSb appears also in Naki proper (u) and in Burmese (ate-), but Burmish-Loloish in general has two primary oSb terms. Nzong Rongma shows a complete reversal of the ordinary pattern, with terms for oSb, yB, and ySi. Tibetan, Lepcha, Daflа, Khoibu, Aka, Liqa, Chang, Chinbon, Ao and probably other less accurately recorded languages have what appears to be the basic arrangement, viz. oB, oSi, and ySb (three primary

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

terms). The Burish languages in general employ the root *nau yŠb in the meaning "yŠi" and have developed a new term for yB (perhaps connected with the Kachin term for B,ws), while Meithei reverses this process in employing *nau for "yB" and the Kukish root *kzar·Si(ms) for yŠi. Simple terms for either B or Si are almost entirely lacking in Tibeto-Burman. Abor-Miri has terms for B and Si based on a root *buir (cf. a-buir "friend"), while in Dafla the cognate form *bŏr is used as the root for yŠb, but note that Abor-Miri also possesses especial terms for oŠb and yŠb. Mikir kor Šb, like Abor-Miri buir, also has the more general meaning "friend".

Though the principle of age distinctions can be established as a basic feature of Tibeto-Burman kinship terminology, the status of sex-of-speaker distinctions is not so readily settled. We are handicapped here by the fact that most of our sources can not be depended upon in showing non-European distinctions of this type, and that negative evidence is therefore of little value. Distinct terms for Si(ms) and B(ws) are found in Tibetan, Kachin, Lushei and Lakher (and probably other Kuki languages), and Angami. Lushei and Lakher also have a distinct term (of periphrastic origin) for Si(ms). In Burmese and Nyi the distinction is applied only to yŠb, viz. Burmese yB(ms), yB(ws), yŠi(ws), yŠi(ms), Nyi yŠb(ms), yB(ws), yŠi(ms), and Maru, in the same linguistic group, has a distinct term for yB(ws). Mikir distinguishes between oŠi(ms) and oŠi(ws), and has a distinct term for B(ws). Chinbok and Yindu, in the Southern

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197 Naid group, have a full set of eight Hb terms, showing complete distinctions both for age and for sex-of-speaker. The Chinbok system can be reduced to five primary terms, viz. pai oSi(ws), pwe oS(ms), nau y5b(ws), be Si(ms), and beng B(ws), i.e. the Tibetan-Kachin arrangement. Sex of speaker appears not to be distinguished in Kanauri, Abor-Miri, Dafla, Barish, Meithei, and some other languages, but our sources, as mentioned above, are not of the most dependable sort. In view of the weight of evidence above, from such key languages as Tibetan, Kachin, Burmese, Mikir, and Lushei, the writer is inclined to regard the sex-of-speaker distinction as an archaic Tibeto-Burman feature.

Despite the fact that no single gCh root can with certainty be reconstructed for Tibeto-Burman, one can surely regard the presence of a primary gCh term as a basic feature for this linguistic family. Aside from the tendency to equate gCh with N or C (vide infra), it can be stated that most Tibeto-Burman languages have a distinct, usually primary, term for gCh, e.g. Kachin ˇsu, Burmese mre$^{3}$, Byangsi k'we, Kanauri o'ay, Lepcha a-son, Chang ˇsi, Garo and Mikir su, Meithei i-su. If a single gCh root must be predicated, TB *su must be regarded as the most likely selection. Equations of gCh other than with N are exceptional, but note Sema a-nu gCh= Ch( < TB *snu y5b).

The above discussion is resumed in the following diagram:

SA
601
193
197
ST
601
193
197

## Tibeto-Burman Basic Pattern

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| gM (*p'i) | | | gF (*p'u) |
| M (*ma) | | | F (*p'a) |
| oZ1(ws) | | | oZ(ms) |
| Z1(ms) | yZb (*nsu) | | B(ws) |
| | Ch (*za) | | |
| | gCh | | |

It would be a rather hazardous undertaking to attempt any general explanation of the pattern outlined above in terms of sociological factors. A broad theory of this type must be based on a comprehensive comparative survey of Tibeto-Burman with a number of other groups, and as such lies outside the scope of the present study. Many of the variations from this pattern are undoubtedly significant, but they involve those elusive culture-linguistic intangibles which do not lend themselves to arm-chair analysis. It is only in the collateral and affinal nomenclatures that obvious cultural correlations are available, and it is these that the writer proposes to consider in some detail.

The distinction between cross (FSi and MB) and parallel (FB and MSi) FSb terms is almost universal in Tibeto-Burman. No instances of an equation of FB with MB have been encountered, but FSi and MSi are equated in Bahing, Lepcha, and Chinbon, if we can trust our sources. Note that Lepcha also equates zC with pC, and that cross-cousin marriage is forbidden in this tribe.

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

The parallel FB and MSi terms are usually either equated with the F and M terms (as in Chang, Lushei, Angami, Sema) or are based on these terms, with the addition of elements meaning "big" and "little" or the like. In other words, age distinctions are made in the parallel FSb terms precisely as in the Sb terms, though with categorical rather than primary elements. By way of contrast, the cross FSb terms seldom show these age distinctions, but note Burmese $u^3$-$ri^3$ HoB (cf. a-$ri^3$ FSi), $u^3$-$mang^3$ HyB, Chinbok pu-$\check{s}r\check{o}$ HoB (= gF), pu-ko HyB (these distinctions are typical of Southern Kuki in general). Some of the more characteristic examples of age distinctions in FB terms are listed below:

| Language | FoB | FyB |
|---|---|---|
| Balti | a-ta ts'ar-ma | a-ta tsun-tso |
| Lepcha | a-bo-tim | a-bo-cum |
| Kachin | wa-di | wa-doi |
| Burmese | p'$\check{a}$-kri$^3$ | p'$\check{a}$-t'we$^3$ |
| Nyi | a-ba-gi$\tilde{a}$ | a-ba-[illegible] |
| Haka | pa-u | pa-nau |
| Siyin | pa-lien | pa-no |
| Chinbon | pa k-dŏm | pa k-cui |
| Tangkhul | a-va k'$\check{a}$-r$\check{a}$r | a-va ka-tui |
| Lhota | o-po-ra-mo | o-po-ro |

One occasionally encounters what seem to be primary terms for FB or MSi, but most of these can be explained on the basis of ellipsis, e.g. Maru t'ong HySi but nya-t'ang HySi,

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

p'a-t'ang FyB in the closely related Lushi language; Bodo a-yong FoB and a-doi FyB, but ma-yong MoSi and ma-doi MySi; Mzong Rengma a-nyo FyB (nyo Ch), and perhaps Changki (Ao) a-za FyB < *za Ch. Kanauri has a curious diminutive formation, viz. a-mats MSi < a-ma, and a-pats FB < a-pa. Tibetan and Nung, however, appear to have four true FSb terms. The Nung terms a-tsim MSi and a-wang FB have been compared with Tsangla a-zim MSi and Garo a-wang FyB, respectively. The Tibetan term sru MSi seems to have been derived from a root with the generalized meaning "mother's relatives", or "member of mother's clan, first ascending generation". Tibetan k'u FB, it can now be stated, has been developed from the TB root *k'u MB, and the Himalayish and Lepcha employment of this term in its Tibetan setting must be credited to Tibetan influence, which is conspicuous in both of these areas. Tibetan skud < *k'u Fl,Bl is to be explained in terms of xC marriage and the equation of MB with WF, as elsewhere in Tibeto-Burman. Tibetan 'a-ne FSi,MBW further fits into this picture. In Himalayish, Kanauri ru Fl < *sru MSb, and o'ad Sl < *ts'a SiS(ms) suggest a like reconstruction. We have some material on xC marriage in the Tibetan area, but the term skud itself is, for the writer, the most significant single piece of evidence. Those who minimize the value of linguistic "fossils" in general might well take note of this term.

The semantic shift FB < MB in the Tibetan term k'u still requires explanation. Elsewhere in Tibeto-Burman the term has

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197 been demoted to affinal rank or dropped altogether, but nowhere else has it been applied to FB. Now there is but one marital feature in which the Tibetan area (including the Kanauri group of Himalayish) significantly differs from the remaining Tibeto-Burman area, viz. polyandry. Fraternal polyandry of Tibetan type is practised by the Kanauri, almost certainly through Tibetan influence, since this custom is explicitly stated to be absent among the Almora peoples (Byangsi, Chaudangsi, Johar). Among the Lepcha polyandry is an abnormal trait and can unhesitatingly be assigned a Tibetan origin. Among other Tibeto-Burman group for which we have any record, polyandry either is said to be lacking or is simply not mentioned. Since Tibetan polyandry is of fraternal type, the importance of FB can readily be understood. It would seem that the MB term, which is unstable in most TB groups, was first replaced by the honorific term ʾa-žang and later applied to FB. The collective term shud-po Fl,Bl, having already been semantically specialized in an affinal sense, was naturally retained.

Primary cross PSb terms are basic TB features, and are represented by the roots *ni FSi and *kʾu MB. The first of these two terms, however, is much more stable than the second, and significantly so (if statistically treated). Thus, Tibetan has transferred the MB term to FB and used an honorific for MB; Burmish-Loloish has retained the MB term only as an honorific applied to oB (in Burmese) or as an affinal term

SA (Ahi, Moso) and has developed new terms for MB (Burmese wə̀,
601 Lolo ʻru); the Kuki languages proper have dropped the MB term
193 altogether and equated MB with gF; in the Naga group the MB
197 term has been preserved in its original setting only in Ao,
ST while in Rengma and Sema it has been retained only in the
601 affinal nomenclature. All of these groups, however, have the
193 root ʻni FSi in its original setting. Burmese (but not
197 Burmish-Loloish) has replaced both the FSi and MB terms and dropped the former altogether, while Kachin has retained both terms only in its affinal nomenclature. The relatively greater stability of the FSi term is also evident in the borrowings made by various TB groups (infra).

This "differential variability" in the FSi and MB terms must be viewed in connection with the affinal application of these terms and the whole problem of cross-cousin marriage. Under bilateral xC marriage MB becomes Fl, and FSi becomes Ml, and it is not unlikely that honorific terms should become associated with these socially "pivotal" relationships. The fact that the MB=Fl term is more susceptible to this process than is the FSi=Ml term merely reflects the general patrilineal bias of Tibeto-Burman societies. The equation of MB with gP, which plays so prominent a role in Kukish, represents one aspect of this whole development, but teknonymy may also be a factor here ("Fl" designated as "gF of my son"). Teknonymy is hardly typical of Tibeto-Burman yet does occasionally occur. Lepcha, for example, employs a-bo F for Fl

SA 1601 193 197 ST 1601 193 197 where the couple are childless, but t'i-kung gF after the birth of a child, and the descriptive term a-fyat Fl has been derived from an original *sput, which in turn represents a morphological development from the TB root *p'u gF. Vayu ca-k'i Fl appears to be a combination of co < *ca Ch and ki-ki gF. Lahu, in the Southern Lolo group, has a-p'u gF= Fl, a-p'i gM=Ml, and Ahi, in the Northern Lolo group, has zu-p'o WF, also "paternal ancestor". The Chang Sbl terms are of teknonymous origin, e.g. hau-ko Bl(ms)="his MB", but the Chang Pl terms are simply Fl=MB and Ml= FSi. Chinbon equates WF with gF, and WM with gM (rather than with MB and MBW, as in most Kuki languages), but retains the Kuki pattern in the HM and HF terms (HF= FSi, and especial term for HF), i.e. the teknonymous (or honorific) terms are employed only by the husband. The Mirish languages (Abor, Miri, Dafla) afford the best illustration of teknonymy. In Miri the terms a-bu and a-nẽ are used for F and M, respectively, but in the closely related Abor language these terms are applied to gF and gM, though ta-ta (Miri ta-to gF) is retained as the vocative term for gF. In this instance the child has taken over his parents' terms ("reverse teknonymy") rather than the parent his childrens' terms. Abor also uses the vocative gF term (ta-ta) for Fl, while Miri equates Fl either with gF or with MB, and Ml either with gM or with FSi (the equations with MB and FSi are probably only descriptive, though this is not stated in our sources). Dafla equates Ml with gM, probably also Fl with gF.

SA
601
193
197
ST
601
193
197

Under a system of bilateral xC marriage we should expect to find both WF and HF equated with MB, and both WM and HM equated with FSi. This condition is fulfilled in Byangsi and Abor-Miri, where this type of marriage is in vogue. The terminological equation also appears, however, in Bung, Chang, Sema, Nzong Rengma, and Lhota, for all of which preferential MBD marriage is indicated, and in Tangkhul and Angami, for which xC marriage cannot be established.

A system of unilateral xC marriage with MBD should lead to the equation of WF with MB, HM with FSi, and separate terms for HF and WM, as well as distinctions between FSiH and MB, MBW and FSi. Kachin fulfills all these conditions admirably, with unilateral xC marriage coupled with the terminological equations indicated above. The same can be said for the Kuki pattern, as illustrated in Lakher, Thado, Chawte, Tarau, as well as in Mru and Khami, viz. WF = MB, WM = MBW, HM = FSi, HF = FSiH. Unilateral MBD marriage is found among the Thado, Chiru, Anal, Aimol, Purum, and probably the Anal, Sho, and Khami. In Thado this nomenclature is employed only where MBD marriage has actually occurred, P terms being employed under other conditions.

Ntenyi and Anyo Rengma have an intermediate type, with M1 = FSi but WF = MB and a distinct term for HF, but in both languages the MB term is sometimes applied to HF as well as to WF. The closely related Nzong Rengma has a single term for F1 (WF, HF = MB), but retains a distinct term for FSiH. Sema has the same scheme as Nzong Rengma. The Sema term for FSiH,

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

furthermore, is cognate with the Htenyi and Anyo Rengma term for HF, and in Ao the same term appears in its original setting (MB). This Naga material thus shows various stages of the transformation of the affinal terminology through the development of unilateral xC marriage. The discrepancies found in Nung, Chang, and Lhota are perhaps more apparent than real, and in the case of Nung and Lhota, at any rate, our sources may be faulty. Even in these affinal features, however, we must expect to find a certain amount of disassociation, for we must allow for linguistic "lag", i.e. the simple scheme of equating Fl with MB and Ml with FSi tends to be perpetuated even where the development of a unilateral "skew" has rendered it theoretically illogical. This general point has been raised many times before, but will bear repetition in view of the fact that a number of modern theoreticians seem to object to this sort of reasoning.

It is fairly evident that the abandonment of xC marriage as an institutionalized norm has in several different groups resulted in the disappearance of categorical equations. In Tibetan and Kanauri we have only the "fossilized" terms skud-po and ru, respectively, which require comparative studies for a full appraisal of their significance. In Lahul, however, where we have a hint of xC marriage, the equations Fl=MB and Ml=FSi are in evidence. In Burmese itself categorical equations are lacking, and here also we have no evidence of xC marriage, but the situation is reversed in Arakanese (Chaungtha).

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

Maru and Lashi, which are of Burmese stock, equate M1 with FSi, WF with MB, and have a distinct term for FSiH,HF (as in Nsong and Anyo Rengma). Kachin influence perhaps plays a role here, yet the Kachin distinguish between WM and HM, as is consistent with their unilateral xC marriage practice. Nyi, in the Northern Lolo group, has derived its terms for WF and WM from the terms for MB and FSi, respectively, plus the element mo "old", acting here as an honorific, while the Burmish-Loloish affinal root *yok is employed in the terms for HM and HF. Ahi seems to reverse this scheme, to judge from our faulty data on this language. For Lisu we have only what appear to be the vocative terms for F1 and M1 (ma-ma < a-ma M, ba-ba < a-ba F), and hence are not in a position to interpret this Lolo material. The use of respectful designations may be a complicating factor here; cf. Lushei pu-zon WF, pi-zon WM, conforming to the Kuki pattern (from pu MB and pi MBW plus an added element -zon), but pa HF (= F) and nu HM (= M), i.e. a woman equates her husband's relatives with her own blood kin.

Categorical equations in the F1 terms are present elsewhere, but our sources are often incomplete. Garo equates M1 with FSi,MBW, but has a distinct term for F1 (a-bu-di, perhaps "little gF"). Mikir equates WF with MB, WM with FSi (with or without the addition of an honorific suffix), and has a distinct term for HF. If we assume that HM (not given in our sources) is also equated with FSi, this system can be compared with that found in Rengma and Maru. Both Garo and Mikir have

SA 601 193 197 preferential MBD marriage. Meithei equates Ml with FSi, and has i-ku Fl < TB *k'u MB (the MB term is not known for sure, but may be the Indic loan-word māmā); the Meithei are not known to practice xC marriage.

ST 601 193 197 The rest of the collateral terminology (C and N terms) is even more poorly known than the PSb terminology, and presents even more serious problems. In view of the presence of basic TB roots for MB (*k'u) and FSi (*ni) one might expect to find one or more roots for xC, but such is hardly the case. The extension of Sb terms to include pC is practically universal and need not be examined in detail. The lack of especial xC terms is probably associated with the lack of xC marriage, but there are too many lacunae in our data to permit of any final judgment here. Tibetan apparently fails to distinguish between pC and xC, but Burmese perhaps has a distinct xC term (sa-mi$^{3}$-mrok-sa$^{3}$, lit. "D's spouse"!). By way of contrast, Chaungtha, one of the Arakanese dialects, has yauk-pa Bl,xC corresponding to Burmese yok-p'a$^{3}$ Bl(ms), in conformity with its equation of Fl with MB and Ml with FSi, i.e. an affinal term has "invaded" the consanguineal nomenclature.

Terms for xCe and xCi in conjunction with xC marriage are found in Byangsi-Chaudangsi, Abor-Miri, Lisu, and Chang, while Dafla has this terminological pattern but without data on xC marriage. Chang appears to have preferential MBD marriage, but the bilateral type is found among the others.

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197 Byangsi-Chaudangsi makes a sex-of-speaker distinction, viz. xCi(ms), xCe(ws), xC(ss), and Abor-Miri makes an age distinction. None of the terms involved is associated with a PSb term or a N term. The Abor-Miri terms show "invasion" from the affinal terminology, as in Chaungtha, e.g. mag-bo xCe(os) = oBl,Sl, from TB *mak Sl. Note that in Byangsi-Chaudangsi, Abor-Miri, and Chang this xC pattern is associated with the simple Pl = PSb categorical equations (for Lisu we lack full information on the Pl terms).

Cross-cousin terminologies of Omaha type are found in two primary foci, viz. Kachin and Kukish. The correlation between the Omaha nomenclature and patrilineal descent, one of the few widely accepted anthropological generalizations, obtains both among the Kachin and the various Kuki and Naga tribes. Of the Tibeto-Burman peoples only the Garo and Khasi, in the Barish group, are known to have matrilineal descent, and unfortunately we know nothing of the cousin terminology in use among these tribes. There is a hint of the Crow type of terminology in Bodo, also in the Barish group, but we cannot be sure that the Bodo reckon descent in the matrilineal line. Bodo (nang-)a-doi "(thy) oBCh", (a-)doi FyB show reciprocity, as has already been pointed out, but Bodo nam-ba-noi "(thy) SiS", (nang-)a-noi "(thy) SiD", and a-noi FSi cannot be explained on this basis and suggest rather the Crow pattern. It is greatly to be regretted that our Garo sources fail us at this critical point.

SA
601 The Kachin system, which is quite distinct from that found
193 in Kukish, merits especial examination. The key terms are as
197 follows:
ST

Kachin Omaha Pattern

(Consanguineal)

601 moi FSi — ts'a MB,MBS(ws)
193 ning xCi(ws) — k'au xCe(ms)
197 k'ri FSiD(ms),SiCh(ms)
rat MBD(oms)
nam MBD(yms),BCh(ws)

(Affinal)

ni WM,MBW,WBW — ku HF,FSiH,HoB,oSiH(ws)
moi HM — ts'a WF,BWB(ws)
ning HSi,BW(ws) — k'au WB,SiH(ms)
nam Di,WySi,yBW(ms),WBCh — k'ri Si,HSiCh,FSiHSi
rat WoSi,ySiH(ws),oBW(ms),HyB

The main features of this system have already been discussed in pt. 7. It will be observed that the lineal equations characteristic of the Omaha pattern appear only in the terms for non-marriageable cross-cousins under the Kachin unilateral xC marriage arrangement, i.e. a man equates his (non-marriageable) FSiD with his SiCh, while a woman equates her (non-marriageable) MBS with her MB. The terms applied by a woman to her (marriageable) FSiS are not known, but a man equates his (marriageable) MBD with his WSi. Distinct terms are used by speakers of each sex for xC(ss).

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

On the basis of comparative material, the terms nam and k'ri must be regarded as originally affinal (D1 and S1, respectively). Both terms have "invaded" the consanguineal nomenclature via the categorical equations D1=BD(ws) and S1=SiS(ms), as are consistent with the practice of MBD marriage. Note that both terms have become neuter in the course of this transformation. We must next enquire of the fate of the original xM terms thus displaced. The terms moi FSi and ts'a MB can be called upon at this point. We lack comparative material on moi, but Tibetan has ts'a SiS(ms) corresponding to the Kachin term, and we can therefore interpret Kachin ts'a MB as a product of reciprocal usage. We have conclusive support for this view in the term k'ri HSiCh,FSiHSi, which at first puzzled the writer. Under the Kachin tripartite organization, as described by Gilhodes, FSiHSi becomes MBW, and MBW ~ HSiCh are reciprocal terms. Since moi FSi closely parallels ts'a MB, we are justified in interpreting this term analogically as a reciprocal development from BD(ws).

To continue our analysis, moi and ts'a have displaced the original cross FSb terms ni and ku, which are retained in the affinal nomenclature. An original system of bilateral xC marriage must be postulated to account for ni WM,MBW < FSi, and ku BF,FSiH < MB. The categorical equations shown by ning xCi(ws)= Sil(ws) and k'au xCe(ms)=Bl(ms) also call for this type of marriage.

To complete our reconstruction, the terms ning, k'au, and rat must be regarded as originally consanguineal rather

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

than affinal. We have comparative material only for ning, which is represented by Chang (Konyak) nyŭng < ning xC, Mikir nang < ning BW(ws). We must further reconstruct rat as the term for xC(ds), i.e. the marriageable xC under the original bilateral xC marriage arrangement. This yields the theoretical categorical equations xCl(ms)=Sil(ms) and xCe(ws)=Bl(ws). Under the conventional type of levirate, which is found among the Kachin, a distinction must be made between the (marriageable) oBW and the (non-marriageable) yBW. In Kachin this distinction is made, in the case of a man, by equating yBW with Dl (nam) and in retaining the term rat for oBW, and, in the case of a woman, by equating HoB with HF (ku) and in retaining the term rat for HyB. Since a man marries his MBD, the distinction between rat MBD(oms) and nam MBD(yms) is the natural result of that described above. It is a fair inference that the missing terms for FSiS(ws) are ku FSiS(ows) and rat FSiS(yws). Note that the equation of MBD(yms) with BCh(ws) is a by-product, so to speak, and is not to be taken as a 'Crow' feature.

We are now in a position to evaluate the Omaha features of the Kachin system. It has been demonstrated that the Kachin have developed a unilateral xC marriage system from an original bilateral arrangement, and that this shift has produced a profound transformation in the kinship terminology. The equating of MBS(ws) with MB, and of FSiD(ms) with SiCh(ms) serves to distinguish the non-marriageable from the marriageable

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

cross-cousins. These equations closely parallel those already noted in the Sbl terminology, and appear to form part of the same pattern. If this inference be correct, we must regard the institution of the levirate as a contributing factor here.

The Kachin terminology under the original bilateral xC marriage system can be reconstructed as follows:

Reconstructed Kachin System

(Consanguineal)

| | |
|---|---|
| ni FSi | ka MB |
| ning xCl(ws) | k'au xCe(ms) |
| rat xC(ds) | |
| moi SD(ws) | ts'a SlS(ms) |

(Affinal)

| | |
|---|---|
| ni MBW,Ml | ka FSlH,Fl |
| ning Sll(ss) | k'au Bl(ss) |
| rat Sbl(ds) | |
| nam Dl | k'ri Sl |

Maru and Lashi, which are of Burmese stock, show Omaha features of Kachin type, e.g. Lashi so-ok FSlD(ms),SlCh(ms) and zo-auk Sl (a variant of so-ok), directly comparable with the Kachin term k'ri. Our material here is too uncertain to justify any further investigation of this point, and we have no data on the Maru and Lashi marriage practices. Both tribes are closely identified with the Kachin, and have even incorporated Kachin loan-words into their kinship nomenclatures, so that direct Kachin influence must be reckoned with in this

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

matter. To judge from what little we know of the collateral terms of other Burmish-Loloish languages, Omaha features are not present. There is some evidence suggesting that the root *tu is applied both to M and C in Lisu and in Ulu (Northern Lolo), but the Lisu material is inconsistent and the Ulu material is not precise

The Omaha nomenclatures found among the Kukish tribes are quite distinct in type from the Kachin nomenclature. The Kuki tribes proper, including Southern Kuki and Tangkhul, employ the following basic scheme (in many varieties):

Kuki Omaha Pattern

(Consanguineal)

pi gM,MBD — pu gF,MB,MBS

ni FSi

tu FSiCh,SiCh(ms),gCh

(Affinal)

pi MBW,WM,WSi — pu WF,WB

ni HM — -rang FSiH,HF

mou DI,BW(ws) — mak SI,SiH(ws)

Lushei has an especial term for BCh(ws), viz. va' (apparently connected with the root *wa-H), and Yindu has an especial term for BD(ws), viz. (ka-)li, which has been compared with the root *ma-li gCh (Burmese, Mung), xM (Mikir). In Siyin and Charte, however, BCh(ws) is equated with Ch. The analyzing development in Laiyo has entirely obliterated all traces of the Omaha system, yet the term tu FSiCh is

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197 retained. Haka has both (k-)tu FSiCh and the analytical term (k-)ni fa as an alternative. Lakher applies Sb terms (in address) to FSiCh and occasionally to MBCh, and both Thado and Aimol sometimes apply the oSb term to FSiCh(os). Chinbok employs an analytical term for MBS, but equates MBD with MySi. Thado resembles Chinbok in equating MBD with MSi, but elsewhere the regular equation is with MBW = gM. Chinbok is further aberrant in equating FSiS with SiS(ms) but having a distinct term for gS. Yindu equates DS with SiS, FSiS, but employs an analytical term for SS. Yindu has distinct terms for MBCh, and Kyaw has distinct terms both for MBCh and FSiCh(i.e. Omaha features are lacking). Aimol, if we can trust our sources, has reversed the Kuki pattern, with (ka-)pu FSiS and (ka-)tu-pa MBS. Chinbon has MoBS = MyB, MyBS = WB, reflecting the stress placed on age distinctions in Southern Kuki. Our Chawte material, which is not reliable, indicates a distinction between FSiS(ws) and FSiD(ms), and the equation of SiCh(mws) with gCh. The affinal term mak Sl is commonly replaced by the consanguineal term tu SiS(ms), as in Haka, Chawte, and Sho, and the reverse process whereby an affinal term "invades" the consanguineal nomenclature (as in Kachin) is illustrated by Kyaw sa-mak SiCh(ms) = Sl, and Ayaing Khami mok-sa FSiCh, SiCh(ms) = Sl, both from the root *mak Sl. The latter language has retained the root *tu, however, in the term (ka-)tu FSiCh(ws), gS.

It is evident from the above citations that this Omaha pattern is extremely susceptible to variation at all points.

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197 Nothing approaching the specific Kachin variety has been encountered, however, and the two systems seem to have little in common. In the Kuki system the equations FSiCh=SiCh(ms) and MBS=MB obtain regardless of the sex or speaker, there are additional equations of MB with gF and SiCh(ms) with gCh, and ni FSi is retained as a consanguineal term. In addition, distinct terms for xC(ss) and Sbl are lacking. The historical developments of the two systems have been quite different, if we are permitted to draw inferences from comparative data. The terms pi and pu are the original gP terms (TB *p'i gM, *p'u gF), and the term -rang (prefixed) can be regarded as the original term for MB, cognate with Tibetan ʾa-ʒang < *zrang MB (cf. Kachin ku MF, FSiH=MB). The term tu occasions some difficulty, since we have only the Burmish-Loloish root *tu and the Nung term pa-du, both applied to M (xM in Burmese) for comparison. In view of the parallelism in the equations MB=gF and xM=gCh, however, we must fix the original meaning of tu as "gCh" rather than "xM". The clue to those equations seems to be teknonymy in conjunction with xC marriage, i.e. we must suppose that a man applied the teknonymous terms pu gF and pi gM to his wife's parents, whereas a woman applied the consanguineal terms ni FSi and -rang MB. With the development of unilateral marriage with MBD, a feature found in the Kuki area as well as in Kachin, the two sets of Pl terms were fully differentiated in function, and the term pu Fl=gF replaced the consanguineal term -rang MB, with pi coming into

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

use for MBW. The equation of SiCh(ms) with gCh was the natural result of the above development. Since the term ni FSi was retained in its original setting, no comparable term was developed for the reciprocal relationship BCh(ws). The evidence for the use of teknonymous terms in Tibeto-Burman in general has been resumed above and need not be discussed at this point. Within the Kuki group, note Chinbon (ka-)no-pauk WH=gF and (ka-)nu-bok MoB (probably a variant of the foregoing), (ka-)no WM=gM and (ka-)nok MoBW (probably a variant of the foregoing), but (ka-)ze HF (analysis uncertain), (ka-)zi HM=FSi. Chinbon thus makes use of teknonymous terms precisely as suggested above for the Kuki group in general.

We are still faced with the problem of explaining the equations MBS=MB, MBD=MBW (or MSi), and FSiCh=SiCh(ms). Here again we must take into account the affinal setting of these terms under a system of unilateral xC marriage with MBD. The funiamental equation seems to have been that between WF and WB (pu) rather than between MB and MBS, i.e. these kin were identified because of the similarity of their roles as wife's father and brother rather than as mother's brother and mother's brother's son. In other terms, the especial position of MB and MBS among the Kuki groups seems in large measure to have arisen through xC marriage. The equation of FSiCh with SiCh(ms) reflects the equation of MBS with MB, just as the equation of SiCh(ms) with gCh reflects the equation of MB with gF.

It is possible to conceive of the Kuki development without recourse to teknonymy simply by assuming that pu gF was

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197

applied to MB and MBS in an honorific sense, with tu gCh SiCh(ms)=FSiCh as a complementary equation. In any event, the equation in the MB line must be regarded as the primary one, and the equation in the FSi line as complementary. The same situation was found to obtain among the Kachin (supra).

The Naga languages, which make up the northern division of the Kukish group, also reveal Omaha features, which are of Kuki rather than Kachin type. MBD is equated with MSi or MySi rather than with gN=MBW. In Ao (all three dialects) the terms for gF (o-pu) and gCh (sam-cir) are distinct, i.e. there is no teknonymy, the TB root *k'u is retained in the consanguineal nomenclature (o-k'u MB,MBS) while MBD is equated with MySi, and the affinal terms for Sl (a-nok) and Dl (a-mu) are applied to FSiS,SiS(ms) and FSiD,SiD(ms), respectively, precisely as in Ayaing Khami. Sema has a distinct term for gF (neuter) and equates gCh with Ch, but has developed a new root for MB,MBS (a-ngu) and has retained the root *k'u only in the affinal meaning "FSiH" (a-ci). Thus both Ao and Sema show full Omaha features without distinction of sex of speaker (as in Kuki) but also without teknonymy (as in Kachin). The Angami, Rengma, and Lhota systems, however, all show teknonymous features. Rengma (all three dialects) equates MB,MBS(os) with gF (ggF in Nsong), and FSiCh,SiCh(ms) with gCh. Lhota shows a partial equation of MB,MBS with gF (o-mo and o-mo-tsü) and at least similar terms for FSiS,SiS(ms) and gS (o-hro and o-hre). Angami equates FSiS,ySiS(ms) with gS, but distinguishes between

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197 gF and MB, yet the term for the latter (mi) is connected with the Rengma term for gF,MB (a-mi ~ a-mui) and the Lhota term for MB (o-mo) and gF (o-mo-tsŭ). We can thus interpret Angami mi MB as the original term for gF,MB and in this way explain the lack of symmetry in the Angami nomenclature as it now stands (a man calls his sister's child "gCh", but a child calls his mother's brother "uncle"). Angami lacks the Omaha traits on one side, since MBCh is addressed or described by name, or analytically if the need arises. The Rengma equations on the MB side appear only in the vocative nomenclature, and only when the cousin (MBS or MBD) addressed is older than speaker.

As noted in pt. 16, Majumder attempted to explain some of the features of the Sema nomenclature in terms of marriage with F's widow, after the fashion instituted by Rivers. Almost no instances of marriages of this type have been encountered in the Tibeto-Burman area, however, and the writer fails to see how Rivers' theories are of any relevancy in the present situation. The most curious form of marriage noted is the Lisu marriage with FSi cited by Fraser, and this is not reflected in the Lisu nomenclature. Omaha features among the Omaha and Miwok are perhaps based on WBD marriage, but for the American evidence there is no unanimity of opinion, and at least three recent writers on the subject (White, Gifford, Tax) have attacked this as a general explanation. Of this trio White alone suggests a general explanation, viz. that the Omaha type

SA 601 193 197 ST 601 193 197 is developed from the Dakota-Iroquois type (pC=Sb, xC distinct term) under the influence of a mature and vigorous patrilineal clan system. Gifford has successfully attacked this view on the basis of the American material, and the same general strictures are applicable in the Tibeto-Burman field, where no correlation can be established between strong patrilineal clans and the Omaha type of terminology.

The Kuki equation of xN with gCh is also encountered in Miri (ā < o-i "child below") and Tibetan (ts'a). Miri has retained the TB root *k'u MB (a-kū), but does apply teknonymous terms to Fl and Ml (= MB and FSi under the Miri bilateral xC marriage system). In Tibetan, however, teknonymy has been found only in the dialect of Bathang (eastern Tibet) as recorded by Desgodins, who cites rmo-rmo Ml = MW (hence a man's term for his WM). Abor shows reverse teknonymy in the shifts a-bu gF < F and a-nā gM < M, reflected in the equation o Ch = M = gCh (Abor, like Miri, applies teknonymous terms to Fl and Ml).

SA 601 ST 601 We are perhaps not justified in concluding that all equations of xN with gCh are based on teknonymy involving the affinal nomenclature (gF > Fl = MB), but no better general explanation can be suggested. The general thesis outlined above conforms to the basic Tibeto-Burman sociological pattern of cross-cousin marriage, and thus enjoys an initial advantage over any alternative theories of a more an hoc nature.

Reciprocal terminology has already been mentioned in connection with Kachin ts'a MB < SiCh(ms), k'ri HBiCh, FSiHBi,